

## TAX RELIEF FOR THE AMERICAN FAMILY

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I had the opportunity to listen to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Vermont. And now that we have established this interim accord and agreement, thankfully, for the first time in decades we will have a balanced budget in the United States. Now will come the debate of the priorities within that balanced budget, and we saw a precursor in the remarks by the Senator from Vermont.

The Senator takes exception to the tax relief proposal that is in the congressional budget that we will soon give to the President. Both the House and the Senate have approved \$245 billion in tax relief for American families and communities and businesses over a 7-year period.

Mr. President, just several weeks ago the President of the United States acknowledged to an audience in Houston, TX, that his 1993 tax increase, which was the largest in American history, might have been a mistake. In fact, he said it was a mistake. And it was indeed.

What is interesting is the size of that tax increase that the President has now suggested was a mistake was about \$250 billion. It is interesting to note that this tax relief that we are talking about is \$245 billion. One cannot miss the similarity of the two numbers. In fact, Mr. President, what you are about to have here is a Congress acknowledging that that tax increase was a mistake and is in the business of refunding it and undoing it and fixing it.

I am rather new here, Mr. President, but I am always amazed by the idea that you hear expressed here that the best way for the resources of America to be managed, in the minds of so many people in Washington, is that everybody gets a wheelbarrow out and ships everything they have earned up here so that a policy wonk can decide what the priorities are of American families and businesses and communities. I do not think our forefathers had that in mind, Mr. President.

I was just over at the first Senate Chamber a moment ago. I like to walk by there and think about Thomas Jefferson giving his inaugural address there. He did not have in mind that all the fruits of labor of American families was supposed to be shipped up to the capital and reconfigured and sent back according to the priorities of somebody here.

That is not what they had in mind. In fact, he is very quotable on this subject, almost refers to it as treasonous when the fruits of labor are taken from the person who earned it, removed from them and given to somebody else to pursue another set of priorities.

Mr. President, just 40 years ago—we do not have to go all the way back to Jefferson—just 40 years ago American families, in 1950, were sending 2 cents—2 pennies—out of every dollar they

earned to Washington, to defend the Nation, to build the ports, the roads, the basic functions of the Federal Government. Today, that same family sends virtually a quarter of their labor to Washington, and then almost that again to local and State governments. But the important point I am addressing here today is that a quarter of all the earnings of an American family are removed from the family.

We hear about, and heard it all through this debate, about how we have to have program after program for the benefit of the American family. And I can tell you, Mr. President, that if you line the American families up and ask them, "Would you rather have the resources yourself to decide how to best house and educate, provide for the health of your family, or would you rather send the check in to the Federal Government and let them decide how to manage your family," the crescendo in chorus of Americans would be, "We can do it better."

The leader just referred to the gentleman that had 10 children who under this tax relief proposal would have \$5,000 more to provide for those children. He is so right when he says, Mr. President, "I can do it better than you or the Federal Government."

In general, this tax relief will put \$2,000 to \$3,000 on the kitchen table of every average American family—\$2,000 to \$3,000. That is a combination of lower interest rates and an expanding economy that comes from the balanced budget and the tax credits and the tax relief.

Now, after we get through raking the Government through these families, they end up with about \$25,000 to \$27,000 that is left for them to run the average American family. That is disposable income, money that we have not taken away. That is not very much.

We have marginalized middle America. We have pushed them to the wall. So a proposal that gives \$2,000 to \$3,000 represents virtually a 10- to 15-percent pay raise and one they get to keep.

This money all becomes disposable income. That is a dramatic infusion of resources that will improve that family's ability to care for itself. In the end, Mr. President, it is the family we count on to raise America, not the Government. It is the family we count on to nurture and grow America and work and build a home and heat it and educate their children and care for the older members of the family. It is the family unit that we depend on to build America. That is where the resources need to go.

America will prosper from this because we will make those families stronger, more able to do the very jobs we want them to do for us. That is where America is built, in those average, hard-working families from my State to yours, Mr. President.

This proposal produces so much good for them. It means we will enter the new century with our families in better

condition. We will relieve the burden on them. We will have an expanding economy, and the world is watching us—the world is watching us. You suggested that in your remarks—the dangers of the world. We will be most able to be the superpower we are if we are financially healthy, and these balanced budgets do just that. These balanced budgets mean America will march into the new century, not stumble into the new century.

Mr. President, this Senator, and I know many, many others, like yourself, have waited long, long years for a Congress to seize our financial affairs and do the kinds of things that will make us a strong nation, because in the end, none of us know a family or a person or a business or a community that can do the job it is supposed to do if it becomes financially decrepit, which is the path we are on. You do not know people like that, nor will you ever, and this is true of nations as well, Mr. President. A nation must first be financially healthy, and then it can carry out its duty honorably and appropriately.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and in that no other Senator is present, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXPRESSING THANKS AND GOOD WISHES TO THE HONORABLE GEORGE M. WHITE

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 33, a concurrent resolution to express thanks and good wishes to the Honorable George M. White on the occasion of his retirement as Architect of the Capitol, submitted earlier today by Senators MOYNIHAN, WARNER, and PELL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33) expressing the thanks and good wishes of the American people to the Honorable George M. White on the occasion of his retirement as Architect of the Capitol.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution expressing the thanks and good wishes of the American people to the Honorable George M. White, FAIA, on the occasion of his retirement as the Architect of the Capitol on November 21, 1995,

after nearly a quarter-century of service to the Nation.

It is not widely known, and as is the case with active men, soon overshadowed by yet larger accomplishments, but within a few short months of his appointment as Architect of the Capitol in January 1971, George Malcolm White did something which had long eluded Nixon and was even beyond the grasp of the second Roosevelt. He reshaped the High Court. With a few strokes of the pen, he changed the shape of the Supreme Court bench from straight to slightly angled toward the ends and back at the middle. Chief Justice Warren Berger assembled the Associate Justices and explained, "When it comes to architecture, by law, the Supreme Court will obey this man." And the Court has been the better for it.

That George White should instantly command such respect as Architect came as no surprise to me; after all, I had recommended him to the office. Since Washington's time and until 1989, the Architect was simply picked by the President and presented to the Congress. No advice and consent involved. I was domestic counselor to President Nixon when on May 24, 1970, word came that the previous Architect, former Congressman and former contractor J. George Stewart, had died in office. President Nixon asked me to find him a successor. I suggested that this time we pick an architect. The result was George Malcolm White, the ninth architect of the Capitol. And 25 years later, the Capitol has never looked better.

I am aware that the Capitol as we know it is a felicitous accretion of separate elements. Some would reason from that, apparently, that each succeeding generation may add to the building at its pleasure. But the various pieces that now comprise this magnificent composition were all designed in the course of one-half century's work by a string of extraordinary minds, both Architects and Presidents. If the tone of architectural debate has been lowered since the day Jefferson and Latrobe locked horns over whether the column capitals in the House Chamber should be modeled after those in the Theater of Marcellus in Rome or the Choragic Monument to Lysicrates in Athens—Latrobe won; choragic it was—it is a failing purely on the part of the modern-day Executive. George White has upheld the tradition of the early Architects of the Capitol.

Like them, he is a polymath. He holds degrees in engineering, in business administration, and in law as well as in architecture. He is registered in and has practiced these as well. Unlike Thornton, he is not a medical doctor, but that can be excused. Beginning in 1988, I had the pleasure of chairing the Judiciary Office Building Commission, a body which was careful to stay out of George White's way as he used his master-planning skills to propose, his legal skills to enact, his business skills to finance, and his architectural and engi-

neering skills to design and construct what is generally considered the best new Government building in a generation, the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building at One Columbus Circle.

While the Capitol grounds and several of the buildings in the Capitol complex bear his stamp, George White has made the Capitol itself the focus of his life's work. He added balance and proportion where he found it lacking and improved what was existing when it needed his care. Who else could recognize stone shock in the west front and repair it to a state better than before the British arrived? From the foundations of the east steps of the House, to the Minton tiles on the floor, to the murals and frescoes on the walls—indeed, to the crown of the Statue of Freedom atop the dome which he climbed and made new with great panache and little regard for his own safety—nothing has escaped his hand, and all is better than he found it.

The Capitol was built as an expression of our beliefs. It was not an efflorescence of elite aestheticism; it was and remains the bone and muscle of our democracy. More than we care to realize, what we build, destroy, or preserve tells future generations the sort of people we are. Next to the social edifice of our Constitution and our Bill of Rights, the Capitol may be the most important legacy we leave behind. For nearly a quarter-century as Architect of the Capitol, George White has given his very fiber to preserving and improving that legacy, and we are thankful for it.

Mr. President, this is a resolution to recognize and commend the Architect of the Capitol, the Honorable George M. White, FAIA, for his outstanding service to the Nation, and to tender to him the thanks and good wishes of the American people on the occasion of his retirement.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am honored to join my good friend and colleague from New York, Mr. MOYNIHAN, in submitting this resolution recognizing the Honorable George M. White on the occasion of his retirement as Architect of the Capitol.

Since being appointed by President Nixon in 1971, Mr. White has served the Congress and the Nation with the utmost dedication and professionalism. During the nearly 25 years he served as Architect of the Capitol, Mr. White presided over the construction and preservation of numerous buildings on the Capitol Grounds. But most importantly, his commitment and expertise has assured that future generations will be able to visit the grounds and enjoy the rich history that is encompassed in the Capitol buildings.

Mr. President, I thank Mr. White for his distinguished service to our Nation and wish him the very best in his future endeavors.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution and preamble be

agreed to, en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, en bloc; and that any statements appear in the RECORD in the appropriate place as if read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

So the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 33

Whereas at its inception, the Capitol of the United States of America was blessed to rise under the hand of some of this Nation's greatest architects, including Dr. William Thornton, Benjamin Henry Latrobe, and Charles Bullfinch;

Whereas prior to the Honorable George Malcolm White, FAIA being appointed by President Nixon on January 27, 1971, it had been 106 years since a professional architect had been named to the post of Architect of the Capitol;

Whereas Mr. White has served the Congress through an unprecedented period of growth and modernization, using to advantage his professional accreditation in architecture, engineering, law, and business;

Whereas Mr. White has prepared the Capitol Complex for the next century by developing the "Master Plan for the Future Development of the Capitol Grounds and Related Areas";

Whereas Mr. White has added new buildings to the Capitol grounds as authorized by Congress, including the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building, the Philip A. Hart Senate Office Building, and the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building, and through acquisition and renovation, the Thomas P. O'Neill and Gerald R. Ford House Office Buildings, the Webster Hall Senate Page Dormitory, and the Capitol Police Headquarters Building;

Whereas Mr. White has preserved for future generations the existing historic fabric of the Capitol Complex by faithfully restoring the Old Senate Chamber, the Old Supreme Court Chamber, National Statuary Hall, the Brumidi corridors, the Rotunda canopy and frieze, the West Central Front and Terraces of the Capitol, the House Monumental Stairs, the Library of Congress Thomas Jefferson and John Adams Buildings, and the Statue of Freedom atop the Capitol Dome;

Whereas Mr. White has greatly contributed to the preservation and enhancement of the design of the District of Columbia through his place on the District of Columbia Zoning Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts, the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, and other civic organizations and commissions; and

Whereas upon Mr. White's retirement on November 21, 1995, he leaves a legacy of tremendous accomplishment, having made the Capitol his life's work and brought to this century the erudition and polymath's capacity of our first Architects: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That the thanks and good wishes of the American people are hereby tendered to the Honorable George M. White, FAIA, on the occasion of his retirement from the Office of the Architect of the Capitol after nearly a quarter-century of outstanding service to this nation.

Mr. COVERDELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I might inquire, what is the order of the day or hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business, with Senators authorized to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I would like to speak in morning business, then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

#### IMPROVING THE MANAGEMENT OF THE PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to address an issue that has been highly controversial in the State of Montana, and throughout the West, for that matter. As we speak, there has been a campaign of disinformation aimed at confusing and scaring residents of Montana into believing that we in Congress are about to sell or give away all of the public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management and sell those lands to big corporations and, of course, to the rich. Of course, nothing could be further from the truth.

I want to take this opportunity to clear the air on some misapprehensions about the issue and where we stand on it, or where I stand. First, let me say I do believe we have to make some changes in the management of public lands because of all the conflict and the controversy that surrounds them. The real issue here is letting local citizens have an effective voice in the management of those lands which have such a direct and important bearing on their lives and their livelihood.

I have cosponsored S. 1031. It was drafted by my good friend, Senator THOMAS, of Wyoming. That bill, if passed, will provide the opportunity to transfer public lands now managed by the Bureau of Land Management, a Federal agency, to those States which wish to have them. This has been proposed by State and local governments, among others, for some time.

The States believe that being closer to the land, they are more capable of managing those lands for the public than ones who were, say, from a State that has no large concentration of public lands or even us here in Washington, DC. And that is probably true. I believe it is time to take a serious look at the alternatives and to decide whether it is an option we want to use in some situations.

As I said, I think some changes should be made in this bill before final passage. But, nonetheless, I want to give the States and their citizens an opportunity to make a decision about local control themselves. Through the public hearing process and committee and floor debates and amendments, we

can decide if, and how, we use this concept to better serve the public's needs.

We face many problems in the management of public land resources today and all those natural resources found on those lands. We have a host of laws which have been developed over more than a century. In many cases they conflict. They are often interpreted differently by agencies responsible for implementing them, so they have different requirements for complying with the law. The result for the average citizens trying to use these lands is conflict, confusion and, of course, frustration. Just like the Federal regulatory process in general, the public land regulations are, in a sense, a mess. Of course, we have to start this process of reforming them.

We had testimony from the head ranger of the Forest Service. He tells us, just about the time they try to make a decision with regard to natural resources found on those lands—we have a lot of laws, and when they get down to the small end of the funnel to where the decision could be made, all at once they are in conflict and therefore no decision is made. Therefore, the inefficiency of running these lands comes to the forefront.

To illustrate what I mean, I have made up these charts. The first shows the BLM permitting process. Those would be those permits required by Federal agencies under law now. The red spots represent all of those other agencies which can deny a permittee the use of BLM land.

When we talk about permittee, that is, if you want to do anything on public land, before you can do anything—and I mean that is from grazing to recreation—it has to jump through the hoops.

I just want to point out, the red dots are Federal agencies that have control over the decisions made on permitting on BLM land. Also, the yellow diamonds are places of conflict which could derail the process and deny access or deny the permittee the use of those lands. Of course, the X's mean that is where it stops; everything stops, the permit is denied.

Whatever it costs, what you want to do is get from here to here and still have money enough to do what you want to do on public lands. Sometimes that gets to be a big race. You start off when the project is proposed. It goes through documents and plan conformance. If they say no, it does not do it, so you start through the process. You amend it, there is public comment, there is a protest. If there is protest by anybody with a 32-cent stamp—a letter from anybody in the country can protest that particular permittee—then it has to go through conflict resolution, through an appeal process again, back to the district manager, and that can be appealed.

So, if the appeal is upheld, the project is not OK'd. If the project is not appealed, if everything goes right and they say no, that appeal should not be

in here, then we start up here and we start through this process. And then, if they allow a resolution, then we have to go back down through here again. We have to jump on.

Remember, I would remind the Chair, remember when we were debating the health care situation of a year ago, a proposal by the administration on all the hoops you would have to jump through and all the new agencies it would create in order to take care of just health care in this country under the plan proposed by the administration? I guess they just love hoops.

Anyway, when you get over it all, walk it all the way through, when you get to here—and remember this all costs a little bit of money along the way—this is the area where you try to work out if you have jumped through all of, or some of, your conflicts. If you get all those done—if you do not get them done you can kill the project here. Here is another stop sign, another place for the project to die. If you get through this—and all this takes time and time is money—before it can be finalized, then something else enters into the project and that is other agencies.

Other agencies now come into play because you have just about done everything required by the agency that really has the responsibility of managing the land, it has pretty much said, OK, so far, so good. Now we have to go to other agencies. For water quality, you have to go through EPA. If EPA says yes, then the permit is approved. Then it goes from there, you have to have public comment on that. When the EPA says OK, still there is an area where the public has access, they can make comment. If they say no, then we are back doing another EIS or another dead end, a stop sign, and the project can die. But say they approve it and say we get along pretty good.

The EPA—and we get down here. So far so good. There is also another section, section 401. That is the Clean Water Act. The State has to sign off on it. The State of Montana does. So does the EPA. There are two different steps in there. It takes time. You have to have a bureaucrat in every one of those stages. Somebody has to push the paper. Somebody has to lick the stamp to get it to go on.

Then you get down here. The permit is approved. You have another comment area. If somebody with that 32-cent stamp is handy again, he can protest it, and it goes into conflict. So now you have to go through another process that kicks it back through the process of the EIS.

There might be some wetlands on it. If you think the Corps of Engineers only does business around the navigable rivers and around our coastlines of this country, you are wrong. The Corps of Engineers does business where you could not float a stick.

So you have to go to the Corps of Engineers. You have to file the application because you have wetlands on